

REMARKS

In the Advisory Action of October 29, 2008 the Examiner held that the proposed amendments of September 29, 2008 failed to place the application in condition for allowance since the changes to Claims 4 and 37 raised new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, and therefore would not be entered.

Applicant has decided to conform the application exactly to what the Examiner indicated would be allowable in order to facilitate issuance of the patent, but without prejudice of applicant's right to file a continuation application with respect to the additional subject matter which applicant strongly feels also to be allowable.

The present amendment does exactly that, namely conforms the application to what the Examiner indicated would be allowable in the Final Action of April 7, 2008.

Thus, Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 5, which the Examiner had indicated would be allowable; Claim 6 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 7, thereby in effect rewriting Claim 7 in independent form, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable; Claim 8 has been amended so as to be in independent form and to include the subject matter of Claim 9, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable; Claim 11 has been cancelled merely to avoid the requirement for correcting the drawing; Claim 17 has been amended so as to be in independent form, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable; Claim 18 depends on allowable amended Claim 8; Claims 19–32, some of which were previously indicated as allowable, all depend, directly or indirectly, from allowable Claim 18; Claim 33 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 8. The remainder of the claims depend from, or have been amended to depend from, an allowable claim.

In addition, six new dependent Claims 64–69 have been added, corresponding to dependent Claims 3 and 10, but made to depend from allowable independent Claims 6, 8 and 17, respectively. It should be noted that more claims have been canceled than added, thereby not increasing the total number of claims pending in the application.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is believed that the amended claims now conform to exactly what the Examiner indicated would be allowable. As indicated above, these amendments are being made merely to conform the claims to what the Examiner indicated would be allowable in order to facilitate the issuance of the patent, and without prejudice of applicant's right to file a continuation application with respect to the subject matter which applicant feels is also allowable, and not covered by the amended claims in the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan

Registration No. 40,338

Date: December 18, 2008

Enclosures:

- Petition to Revive an Unintentionally Abandoned Application
- Request for Continued Examination (RCE)